DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 192 HE 000 135

Recommendations for National Action Affecting Higher Education. A Joint Statement.

American Association of Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.; National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C.

Pub Date Jan 68

Note-44p.; Statement of policy positions adopted during sessions held November 12-15, 1967 in Columbus, Ohio.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.30

Descriptors-Educational Finance, Educational Legislation, Equal Education, Federal Aid, *Federal Programs, Financial Support, Grants, *Higher Education, International Education, *Legislation, *Policy, *Programs

The immediate and future needs for federal action in the area of higher education are outlined, specific proposals are made, and the positive and negative aspects of various prospective legislative programs are delineated. Among the recommendations are: the ability of institutions to provide quality educational programs at all levels for students having a wide range of backgrounds and interests should be strengthened. Education should be provided at a cost most students can afford. Basic research should be expanded and its results used in solving human problems through applied research. Through programs such as the Education Professions Development Act and others, the vocational and professional competence of individuals should be improved. University resources should be made available beyond the campus. The federal government should give greater support to the arts and humanities, help provide genuine access to educational opportunity, and help strengthen the capacity of all educational institutions to assist developing countries and to understand the role and responsibilities of the US in the world. The 2 Associations are strongly opposed to proposals, such as tax credits and required fees, that would throw more of the cost of higher education to the student rather than to society--the main beneficiary. They also oppose proposed programs that would increase discrimination against low-income students, or programs that would reduce the accountability of those receiving public funds for their use. Broad federal support on an institutional basis is urged. (JS)

Recommendations for National Action affecting Higher Education

A JOINT STATEMENT

ED025192

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED025192

HE000 135

JANUARY 1968

THIS STATEMENT OF POLICY

POSITIONS CONCERNING

Recommendations for National Action affecting Higher Education

WAS JOINTLY ADOPTED BY

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE

UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

AND

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

IN SESSIONS HELD

NOVEMBER 12-15, 1967

IN COLUMBUS, OHIO

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

consists of 99 state and land-grant universities and colleges located in each of the 50 states and Puerto Rico. Together, these institutions grant more than one-fourth of all baccalaureate degrees and almost three-fifths of all the doctoral degrees awarded by American institutions of higher education.

Founded in 1887, the Association is the oldest organization of institutions of higher education in this country. It is a completely independent organization that determines its own policies and procedures by action of delegates representing all member institutions in annual convention.

Officers:

Chairman of the Executive Committee

President James H. Jensen
Oregon State University, Corvallis

President of the Association

Chancellor W. Clarke Wescoe
University of Kansas, Lawrence

President-Elect of the Association

President Fred H. Harrington
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Executive Director of the Association

Russell I. Thackrey
1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 462-3888

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

consists of 235 institutions and eight statewide systems of state colleges located in 44 states, the District of Columbia, and the Island of Guam.

Approximately 1.3 million students – or one out of five college students in the United States – attend the type of institution represented by the Association. These institutions are the fastest growing degree-granting institutions in the nation.

The membership includes comprehensive institutions which have developed from single-purpose teachers colleges, newly-established state colleges and universities, technological institutions, and former municipal and junior colleges which have become state institutions.

Officers:

President of the Association

President G. Tyler Miller
Madison College
Harrisonburg, Virginia

President-Elect of the Association

President George F. Budd
Kansas State College of Pittsburg
Pittsburg, Kansas

Executive Director of the Association

Allan W. Ostar
1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 462-2277

INTRODUCTION

In the pages that follow, the Associations cooperating in this statement outline their views of the needs for national action in the area of higher education, both in the immediate future and for the years ahead. The index provides a ready reference to particular topics.

What We Favor

In broad outline, these Associations favor national action designed:

* **To strengthen the capacity of institutions of higher education to provide quality educational programs at all levels for students with a wide range of backgrounds and interests, and at a cost that most students and their families can afford.**

Such programs include, but are not limited to:

Federal grants for the construction of academic facilities, supplemented by Federal loans.

Federal loans for residential and related facilities, at subsidized interest rates when necessary to keep charges to students within reason.

Operating support for all accredited institutions that can participate, so devised as to stimulate and not to replace other public and private sources of support.

* **To extend the frontiers of knowledge through basic research and to bring the results into use in solving human problems through applied research.**

Such programs include both the support of basic and applied research as such and post-baccalaureate and post-doctoral fellowship and traineeship programs designed to prepare individuals to make their maximum contribution to the advancement of knowledge.

They include the work of the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the fellowship and research programs of the U.S. Office of Education, the research and related programs of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and other Federal agencies.

* **To improve the competence of individuals in their professional and vocational capacities through such programs as the Education Professions Development Act, the wide range of special institutes assisted by various Federal agencies, the proposed Intergovernmental Manpower Act, and many others.**

* **To make the resources of our universities and colleges available beyond the limits of the campus in helping solve the problems of urban and rural poverty, in giving individuals oppor-**

tunity for self-improvement and for the updating of professional and technical competence, and in strengthening the capacity of state and local governments to discharge their increasing responsibilities. Examples include the Community Services and Extension Act, the Cooperative Extension program, the State Technical Services Act, the Regional Medical Programs Act, and urban research, fellowship, and related programs.

* To enrich the quality of human life through the arts and humanities.

* To provide genuine access to educational opportunity and thus, in great measure, to equality of opportunity in life for the economically and culturally deprived, through such programs as educational opportunity grants, work-study programs, aid to developing colleges, and the Upward Bound program.

* To strengthen the capacity of the institutions of this country, public and private, governmental and non-governmental, to assist the developing countries of the world, and to increase the capacity of individual citizens to understand the role and responsibilities of the United States in the world community. Examples include the International Education Act, international technical and cultural assistance and exchange programs, area and language programs, etc.

What We Oppose

These Associations are strongly opposed to proposals that, by intention or not, would have the effect of:

* Throwing substantially more of the cost of higher education on the student, rather than on society, which is the chief beneficiary of higher education.

* Increasing discrimmination against low-income students and their families.

* Reducing the accountability of those who receive public funds for their use, through programs designed to circumvent Congressional legislative responsibility for determining the allocation of public funds and the purposes for which they are used.

Such programs include:

Proposals for tax credits for tuition and required fees.

Loan programs the effect of which would be to force an increase in institutional charges to students and indenture individual future income over long periods of years ("Educational Opportunity Bank").

Excessive reliance on attempts to finance education through payments to students to meet rising charges, rather than through programs making it possible for institutions to hold down their charges to students

Budgetary and Financial Considerations (Priorities)

These Associations are mindful, as are all Americans, that implementation of many of these recommendations may not be possible in the light of war demands and pressing needs of other areas of domestic and international concern.

They urge that, if there is no change in budgetary demands associated with war, priority should be given to adequate funding of already established and ongoing Federal programs.

These include, among others, support for research and advanced graduate and professional education, academic and housing facilities, assistance for students from low-income families, aid for developing colleges, public service programs focused on distressed urban and rural communities, and essential international programs.

New Initiatives

If conditions change to permit new initiatives in Federal programs for higher education, first priority should be given to the necessity for general institutional support to colleges and universities, along the lines outlined in this document.

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	**NEEDED: A MAJOR ADVANCE IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION THROUGH SUPPORT OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AS INSTITUTIONS**	1
II.	**AID FOR FACILITIES, HOUSING**	6
	(A) Aid for Academic Facilities	6
	(B) College Housing Loan Program	7
III.	**DIRECT SUPPORT OF GRADUATE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH**	8
	(A) Graduate Fellowships and Traineeships	8
	(B) Federal Support of Research and Education in the Sciences	9
IV.	**FEDERAL ACTION FOR OTHER EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES**	11
	(A) Education in the Health-Related Fields	11
	(B) Increased Support for the Humanities and Arts	12
	(C) R.O.T.C. Programs and Facilities	12
	(D) Educational Research and Development Programs	12
	(E) The Education Professions Development Act	13
	(F) Research and Extension in Agriculture and Related Fields	14
	(G) Aid to Developing Colleges	14
	(H) Computer Facilities and Programs	15
	(I) Establishment of New Federal Degree-Granting Authority and Institutions	15
	(J) Proposal for Research Centers Independent of Universities	16
	(K) Land-Grant Teaching Funds, Morrill-Nelson Act	16
V.	**INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION: UNIQUE CHARACTER OF HIGHER EDUCATION**	17
VI.	**IMPROVING THE CONDITIONS OF URBAN LIFE**	17
VII.	**AID TO INDIVIDUALS IN OBTAINING A COLLEGE EDUCATION**	18
	(A) N.D.E.A. Student Loan Program	19
	(B) Guaranteed Student Loan Program	19
	(C) Work Study	20

(D) Opportunity Grants, Federal Scholarships, Veterans Education 20
(E) Tax-Credit and Student Loan Indenture Proposals 21

VIII. DISCRIMINATION IN THE USE OF PUBLIC FUNDS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES 24

IX. "DISCLAIMER" AFFIDAVITS 25

X. EXTENDING THE RESOURCES OF HIGHER EDUCATION BEYOND THE CAMPUS 25

XI. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AND VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION 27

XII. HUMANE TREATMENT FOR EXPERIMENTAL ANIMALS 28

XIII. NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT 28
(A) Water Resource Research 28
(B) Sea Grant Colleges 28
(C) Air and Water Pollution 29

XIV. INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS 29

I. NEEDED: A MAJOR ADVANCE IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION THROUGH SUPPORT OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AS INSTITUTIONS.

At no time in modern history have the opportunity and need for a major American advance through higher education been as great as they are now.

There have been great improvements in primary and secondary education, both in the percentage of young people finishing high school and the quality of their preparation for further education.

It is clear, however, that the American ideal of equality of opportunity for all depends for its realization on making post-high-school educational opportunity a reality for the culturally and economically disadvantaged, who constitute both the greatest untapped human potential of our society and its greatest problem.

Our social and technological development has steadily reduced the necessity for expending human resources on routine work and created an almost unlimited demand for trained intelligence and disciplined, inquiring minds.

The potential of the university as a resource in solving the problems of our society has been dramatically proven. Federally supported university research and extension work in agriculture provide a great example to America and the world of what the marriage of the advancement of knowledge and its application in the lives of the people can do. Similar advances can be cited in other areas. Demands for speeding cultural and industrial advance and for solving the problems of our cities and of the distressed and dispossed whose manual skills are no longer needed in our rural areas are clear and insistent.

Calls for the college and university to help our society find solutions for its multiple problems and to exercise the leadership for which their staffs are uniquely qualified have multiplied.

These, and the need to accommodate increasing numbers of qualified young people seeking higher education, have increased far faster than have the resources available to respond.

Federal aid designed to help the economically deprived gain access to college has,

ironically as it may seem, actually reduced the capacity of our colleges and universities to educate these same young people by drawing resources from their instructional budgets to administer and match Federal student-aid programs. Programs in support of research, productive and essential as they have been and are, have, because of their project and mission orientation and cost-participation requirements, served to some extent to draw resources and emphasis away from undergraduate education, rather than to complement and strengthen it as they should.

Measures designed to conserve the operating resources of colleges and universities and to enable them to hold down their charges to students while continuing to provide quality education for greater numbers — such as the academic facilities grant and loan programs and the college housing program — are inadequately funded or have excessive matching requirements, or both.

All Federal programs relevant to higher education have suffered during the past year because of the exigencies of a wartime budget, inflationary pressures, and the urgent needs of other high-priority national programs.

Despite the expansion of Federal assistance in education in various areas, it is upon the states and their tax resources that the major costs have fallen of expanding the wide variety of needed public programs in education at all levels and in other fields. The potential for expansion of support from this source is already limited in many states. Public institutions, which have carried the major initiative for expansion to keep opportunity open, find this responsibility an increasingly difficult one to discharge with distinction. To maintain quality, they have raised student charges substantially, turned away qualified students, limited enrollments, and refused requests for urgently needed public service. Even the strongest private colleges and universities, with already high student charges, report they are faced with the certainty of mounting deficits if present trends continue.

Some see the solution to the problem of financing higher education in shifting more and more of the cost of higher education to the student and his family. But the student, in economic terms, is already paying three-fourths of the cost of his education through various types of required charges and foregone earnings. For the most affluent society

in history to deny responsibility for even a minor fraction of the cost of the higher education of its future leaders seems preposterous.

The major advance needed at this point in our history calls for Federal aid in such forms and in such variety as to strengthen all colleges and universities from the weakest to the most prestigious.

The path to great achievement in cultural, social, and economic advance is well established. It is the education of all Americans to their highest potential and the fullest use of the special resources of our higher institutions in research and public service.

It involves continuation and expansion of most programs already under way, particularly in the areas of research, extension and public service, facilities aid, and special aid for both economically deprived individuals and institutions.

But more than that, it requires broad Federal support on an institutional basis: support which will encourage expansion while reducing pressures on student charges; support which will maintain quality in the face of rising costs; support which will recognize that qualitative differences among institutions must be cured by "levelling up" rather than levelling down and that quality lies in the excellence of performance of their different functions by a wide variety of institutions, each according to its own purposes.

There are legitimate grounds for differences of opinion and judgment as to the merits of various plans and formulae for broad institutional support. The century-old experience of the land-grant institutions and the more recent use of the principle of general operating support in certain of the health fields have, however, demonstrated both that acceptable formulae can be found and that broad Federal institutional support, always supplementary and complementary to other established sources, is entirely compatible with the academic integrity and institutional autonomy of our colleges and universities.

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities believe that the field of science offers the best opportunity at present for the initiation of a new program of institutional support, which can, if experience warrants, be broadened to include other fields. By

"science," we mean the broad use of the term to include the social sciences, natural sciences, engineering and applied sciences, and mathematics (as they are already defined by the National Science Foundation).

There is now a long-standing precedent of Federal support of scientific research and of institutes for the improvement of instruction in the sciences. The heavy emphasis on mission-oriented and project support in the sciences and the relative concentration of support in the major universities which are staffed to conduct this type of basic and applied research have created widespread public interest in the procedures and processes by which research support is allocated.

These programs have been of great national value and should be continued and expanded. At the same time, we believe broad institutional support is needed, and that its initiation will strengthen support for concurrent expansion of existing programs. The community college, the primarily undergraduate college, and the university would all be strengthened by support in the sciences that could be used to improve instruction, initiate research, and strengthen the preparation of elementary and secondary teachers in the natural and social sciences.

We are mindful of the need for increased support in the humanities and of objections that may be raised to a program initially limited to the natural and social sciences. Nevertheless, we feel that new and comprehensive institutional support may best be initiated in the natural and social sciences, where there is long experience with and wide acceptance of Federal participation and a substantial and experienced Federal administrative staff in being in the National Science Foundation.

Meanwhile, we urge rapid expansion of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities and believe that inclusion of these areas on formula support on an institutional basis can best be considered after there has been some body of substantial experience with the sciences.

The National Institutional Grants program proposed by these Associations provides broad support for all types of institutions of higher education to complement, and not to supplant or diminish, present programs, and is based on a three-part formula:

(1) One-third of the funds appropriated would be distributed to the institutions as a graduated percentage of the total amount of project awards received by them from the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and the U. S. Office of Education. We suggest that the formula be so designed that all institutions receive 100 per cent of the first $30,000 of this base and that no institution receive more than $300,000 in any one year.

(2) One-third of the funds would first be divided among the several states in proportion to the relative number of high-school graduates in the states and then re-allocated by the responsible Federal agency among the colleges and universities within a single state in proportion to the number of undergraduate semester credit-hours taught by each in accredited programs of instruction in the physical, biological (including agricultural) and social sciences, engineering, and mathematics.

(3) Finally, one-third would be allocated to the institutions in proportion to the number of advanced degrees (both masters and doctoral) awarded by each institution during the immediately previous three years in the physical, biological, social sciences, engineering, and mathematics, including degrees in education which qualify recipients to teach in these fields.

Institutions may be required to report on their use of the funds. They would be encouraged to anticipate future funding in order to design long-range plans for the development of research and educational programs in the sciences emphasizing the achievement of national goals and objectives such as the expansion of educational opportunities and improvement in the quality of the programs offered.

The first part of this program provides institutions engaged in Federally sponsored research with funds for broadly discretionary use to correct imbalances in present research programs and between instruction and research. It gives some recognition to qualitative judgments made over the years by a wide variety of experts in the separate disciplines. The graduated matching schedule and the $300,000 limitation on this part recognizes the special needs of institutions whose research programs are in the developmental stage.

The second part provides substantial funds for all institutions but, by funding introductory courses equally with advanced undergraduate courses, gives favored treatment in relation

to costs to institutions with a large volume of introductory courses, such as community colleges and degree-granting institutions emphasizing broad undergraduate, rather than highly specialized, instruction.

The last part, based on the number of advanced degrees awarded, gives special emphasis to institutions not now participating substantially in existing Federal fellowship and trainee programs by weighting intermediate degrees equally with the doctorate and by including degrees involving teacher preparation in the formula.

While each individual segment of the three-part formula may be criticized separately as being inequitable to various types of institutions, we believe that the proposal taken as a whole and in connection with existing programs in the sciences, presents a balanced, equitable approach and would constitute a major breakthrough toward meeting the problem of strengthening and upgrading all higher education.

Together with other programs discussed below, this program would go far toward making it possible for all of America's colleges and universities to keep the doors of higher education open without sacrificing quality and to free resources needed for response to the many demands for assistance in solving the urgent problems of our time.

II. AID FOR FACILITIES, HOUSING.

In addition to the initiation of a new program of general operating support described above, substantial expansion and modification of existing Federal programs designed to keep educational opportunity open by keeping charges to students down are needed. We regret that during the past year these programs have been sharply curtailed either by appropriations or administrative actions.

(A) Aid for Adademic Facilities.

In the first session of the 90th Congress, authorizations for grants for undergraduate and graduate facilities aid programs were substantially expanded, but funding was — unfortunately — cut below previous levels.

We recommend:

(1) That the Federal proportion of matching grants for both undergraduate and

graduate facilities be increased to up to 75 per cent of the cost of such facilities.

(2) Special attention should be given the need for graduate facilities in the light of substantially increasing enrollments and the clear national interest in advanced education and research.

(3) With respect to undergraduate facilities grants:

(a) While the primary justification for the program continues to be to assist in the substantial expansion of enrollment capacity, special attention should also be given to the need for removal or modernization of obsolete facilities.

(b) Federal law should be modified to permit allocation of funds within each state according to demonstrated needs.

(4) The undergraduate facilities loan program legislation should be amended, and the program expanded, along lines suggested for the College Housing Loan Program (see below), in order that adequate loan funds be made available without excessive pressures on the Federal budget.

(B) College Housing Loan Program.

Since its initiation in 1950, the College Housing Loan Program has been tremendously successful in helping provide living accommodations for a rapidly expanding college population at reasonable charges to students.

Since early in 1966, however, it has been virtually "frozen" by administrative action, despite the existence of a combination of the revolving fund and new lending authority totalling several hundreds of millions of dollars.

A study sponsored by the American Council on Education contains minimum estimates of a Federal program loan need of approximately $1 billion a year for the next 10 years. We accept and support these estimates.

We reiterate our recommendation that present legislation be amended in such a way as to assist higher education in generating a capital funding source of not less than one billion dollars each year for the next 10 years for single and married student housing at an interest cost of not more than 3 per cent and for debt terms of not more than 50 years.

Several alternative methods are available to assist in provision of such a capital source.

Legislation to implement one of these methods was introduced in the 90th Congress

by Representative Mink in the House and Senators Javits and Proxmire in the Senate and has been approved by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. It provides for continuance of the direct Federal lending program and its augmentation through the private capital market at minimum Federal cost through an interest subsidy. This proposal minimizes budgetary pressures and the need for new Treasury borrowing by generating a substantial portion of the new capital needed through the private market. For this reason, the Associations have supported and continue to support its enactment by the 90th Congress.

In the same financial framework suggested above for single, married, and graduate students, the Associations also recommend:

(1) That specific provisions be made for assistance in the rehabilitation of existing college housing.

(2) That specific provision be made to provide for housing of those staff members of medical centers whose services are needed on an "on-call" basis.

(3) That assistance in the provision of student-center facilities be continued.

The Associations recommend that the policies, practices, and regulations of the Department of Housing and Urban Development applicable to the College Housing program be reviewed and revised, particularly with respect to debt-service and maintenance reserve requirements.

III. DIRECT SUPPORT OF GRADUATE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH.

(A) Graduate Fellowships and Traineeships.

(1) Doctoral Programs.

The graduate programs of the National Defense Education Act and those administered by the National Science Foundation and other Federal agencies have done much to remove economic barriers to graduate programs and to help keep our country supplied with its scarcest and most valuable manpower resource. The 1964 amendments to N.D.E.A. also make it possible to assure that present resources in existing graduate schools of high quality are fully used. These Associations strongly urge the restoration of N.D.E.A. Title IV fellowships to the authorized 1967-68 level

and the funding of a continuing expansion of this and other Federally supported fellowship programs in keeping with the fundamental nature of their contribution to the continued progress of our Nation.

(2) Master's and Intermediate-level Programs.

There is also need for the support of fellowships and traineeships at the master's and intermediate-degree levels to meet the heavy and increasing demand for college teachers within the broad spectrum of institutions of higher education. The junior and community colleges in particular have critical staffing needs. Passage in the 90th Congress of the Education Professions Development Act provides the necessary statutory authority for the establishment of significant programs to meet these and other needs. The U.S. Office of Education is urged to develop plans for the program flexible and broad enough to permit graduate schools to design a wide range of proposals to meet the varying needs for faculty members in post-high-school institutions.

(B) Federal Support of Research and Education in the Sciences.

(1) Institutional Support in the Sciences

The greatest unmet need in the Federal support of science in this country today is an institutional support program through which flexible, predictable funds can be made available to the institutions of higher education on a continuing basis. To meet this need, these Associations have designed and are supporting the National Institutional Grants Program outlined in the first section of this report. Our Associations commend Representative George P. Miller and others for their sponsorship of this proposal (as H.R. 875 and similar bills) and strongly urge its enactment during the 90th Congress.

(2) Support of Basic Research.

Basic research uniquely provides the building blocks upon which social and economic progress is erected. The need for the expansion of man's knowledge of himself and the world in which he lives accelerates as he himself becomes increasingly responsible for his

own environment, creating along the way difficult and complex problems such as those related to air and water pollution, urban congestion, over-population, and actual physical survival in an age in which man has the ability to destroy himself absolutely. The need for basic information cannot be met on a crash basis when a crisis arises, but can only be met through the continued, dedicated support of those equipped through training to explore the unknown. Because this is true, the fiscal demands of the war effort must not be permitted to disrupt support programs in this area. We urge upon the Congress and the Executive Branch of the government expansion of support for basic research consistent with its fundamental role in the continued progress of our country. We urge this especially in connection with the funding of the programs of the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health, which have primary responsibilities for the support of the unique capability of institutions of higher education for the conduct of basic research.

(3) Indirect Costs of Federally Sponsored Activities.

The Associations commend the Congress for its recognition that the indirect costs of research are real costs that, unless fully reimbursed, constitute a serious drain on the resources of the university — resources that are required for carrying out their primary instructional function and for conducting research in areas where Federal support is limited or lacking. Because this is true, the Associations strenuously object to the mandatory cost-sharing concept introduced in recent Federal legislation. Simple equity dictates that institutions making available their physical and human resources to assist in the attainment of national objectives receive the full costs for doing so, especially when the cost sharing reduces their ability to contribute to the attainment of other, and equally important, national objectives. The Associations consequently urge the Congress to eliminate the cost-sharing requirement and provide additional funding to implement the policy of full reimbursement of indirect costs to make it possible for Federal agencies to fully apply the principles of Bureau of the Budget Circular A-21 in the research relationships between the Federal government and institutions of higher education.

IV. FEDERAL ACTION FOR OTHER EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES.

(A) Education in Health-Related Fields.

The Associations commend the 90th Congress for its recognition of the need for substantial programs of support for education, extension activities, and library services in health-related fields through the enactment of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the Allied Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the Regional Medical Programs Act, and significant expansions of existing legislation. Legislation providing aid for the operation of instructional programs, for library services, for scholarship support, for expansion of educational facilities, and for regional efforts for continuing education and the dissemination of the most advanced medical knowledge will make substantial contributions toward the expansion of professional education in these areas.

Because of its demonstrated effectiveness in increasing the supply of badly needed nurses and in improving the quality of nursing education, the Associations recommend the continuation of the Nurses Training Act of 1964 and urge, additionally, that scholarship assistance be made available for undergraduate students in collegiate schools of nursing and that direct operational support be authorized and made available to schools of nursing conducting collegiate programs for increasing enrollments.

We are gratified that schools of pharmacy and veterinary medicine are now eligible, under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, for aid in the construction of educational facilities. We urge that both authorizations and appropriations for construction assistance be increased substantially to cover adequately the needs in the newly eligible fields. Further, we note with concern that eligibility for assistance for the schools of pharmacy and veterinary science is limited to construction aid. We urge corrective legislation to end this discrimination to major health-related fields, especially as concerns eligibility for basic and special improvement grants for support of the instructional function at schools of pharmacy and veterinary science.

(B) Increased Support for the Humanities and Arts.

We thank the 90th Congress for their increased support of the programs included in the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities. The need to correct the imbalance between Federal support in these important areas with those for science and related fields calls for sharp expansion of funding of these Foundations in the years ahead. We reiterate our belief that, while maintaining active programs of individual and project grants, the new foundation should give major emphasis to the support of institutional programs.

(C) R.O.T.C. Programs and Facilities.

The Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs conducted by the Armed Services, in cooperation with our colleges and universities, have long been the chief source of officer personnel. No other method of officer procurement approaches these in terms of low cost to the Federal government and of the high quality of officers furnished to the Armed Services. In view of the fact that the colleges and universities are making a very significant contribution to the national security through the R.O.T.C. programs, the Department of Defense is urged to give further consideration to a provision for reimbursement of some part of the total costs for operating programs that have, as their primary objective, the production of military personnel. Further, these Associations support the Army and Air Force in their efforts to maintain efficient R.O.T.C. programs and to discontinue those that are clearly inefficient. The effect of present Selective Service deferment policies on R.O.T.C. enrollments is a matter of serious concern.

(D) Educational Research and Development Program.

The relatively modest Federal expenditures for educational research and development have produced useful results despite some lack of clarity in the Federal structures for their administration. Consultation with knowledgeable persons outside the Federal government, coordination of overlapping programs of Federal support, and continuity of program objectives and planning would all improve

Federally assisted educational research. An important missing ingredient may be supplied by the Education Professions Development Act for the support of programs to meet the critical shortage of qualified researchers in the field of education.

Federal support of research and development centers, regional laboratories, and other research and development efforts have made possible significant contributions to the advancement of knowledge concerning the education of children and youth. To date, however, there has been no comprehensive assessment of these activities, nor has there been a definitive statement by the profession of reasonable goals and priorities for educational research and development in the national interest. These Associations therefore recommend that extensive discussions and deliberations involving appropriate representatives of these and other national educational associations be initiated to 1) identify the categories of educational research and development needed to meet the educational requirements of the nation; 2) establish goals and priorities within these categories that should be reached within the next decade; 3) make an inventory of the research and development currently underway within these categories; and 4) estimate the commitments in personnel and other resources that must be made to attain the established goals.

(E) The Education Professions Development Act

All levels of education — from pre-school through graduate school and including vocational and adult education — need a greatly expanded supply of teachers and other professionals. The Education Professions Development Act passed by the 90th Congress should help our colleges and universities meet this critical need. It should also permit identification of those areas most in need of support and provide that support without the imposition of specific categorical legislation to fund it. New, improved, or markedly expanded programs of pre-service and inservice teacher education should be supported at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Congress is urged to fund the Act at the authorized level for fiscal years 1969 and 1970.

Adequate provision for consultation and advice with a broad base of school and university

personnel will be an important factor in the effectiveness of the program. Since the member institutions of these Associations prepare about half of all elementary and secondary school teachers certified each year, it is urged that their central role be recognized through appropriate representation on the advisory bodies concerned with the implementation of the programs under the Act.

(F) Research and Extension in Agriculture and Related Fields

The cooperative programs of research and extension in agriculture and related fields between the Federal government and land-grant institutions has been conspicuously successful both in its results and in the absence from the relationship of many of the problems that characterize government-university relationships in other areas, where the emphasis is on project rather than university orientation. However, Federal support for the programs has in recent years lagged substantially behind rising costs, requiring the states to carry an increasing proportion of the cost of maintaining the programs and restricting needed expansion. There is strong evidence of a changing public attitude toward agricultural research and extension, as the public becomes aware that our situation is no longer one of a surplus problem but one of inadequate supplies of many agricultural products to meet both domestic needs and urgent international commitments. Rising prices have brought greater public understanding of the fact that the chief beneficiaries of efficient agricultural production are the consuming public, now heavily concentrated in large urban areas.

A major long-range cooperative study of agricultural research needs by the Department of Agriculture and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges furnishes, we believe, a sound basis for the needed substantial expansion for agricultural research. A similar cooperative study of agricultural extension is now being made and will, we believe, provide an equally sound basis for future support in this vital companion program.

(G) Aid to Developing Colleges.

The Associations strongly support and urge the continuance of the program of aid to de-

veloping colleges, which is of special importance in the strengthening of colleges now predominantly attended by Negro students. A high percentage of Negro students enrolled in such colleges attend the public colleges and universities represented in the membership of these Associations. The experience with the limited funds available for this program thus far indicates that the yield on the investment is high indeed and merits continuing support.

(H) Computer Facilities and Programs

It has become clear that computational facilities and services are rapidly becoming an educational and research tool as basic to adequate higher education as the library. We agree with the Panel on Computers in Higher Education which last year reported to the President's Science Advisory Committee "both the individual's opportunities and progress and the progress, well-being, and stature of our society can be increased by adequate computing facilities for our colleges and universities." We are gratified at the importance given this matter by the President and the prompt response of the National Science Foundation within the limited resources at its command. It is clear, however, that institutions will not be able to provide adequate budgets for facilities and programs of research and instruction in this area without greatly increased assistance from Federal sources. We therefore urge that existing support programs in this area be continued and strengthened and that they be supplemented through the establishment of a broad program of assistance to all institutions of higher education for the acquisition and maintenance of adequate computer facilities and services to provide the basic educational experiences today required of all young men and women for productive careers, whatever their chosen fields. Legislation for this purpose should be broad enough to permit cooperative arrangements among institutions where it is not feasible to maintain this type of capacity on a single-institution basis.

(I) Establishment of New Federal Degree-Granting Authority and Institutions.

In recent years, many efforts have been made, some successfully, to authorize the

granting of advanced academic degrees by Federal agencies or establishments. We believe these efforts arise from basic confusion as to the nature of a university, the significance and meaning of the academic degree, and the resources of the non-Federal academic establishment.

The basic characteristic of the university as a center for the advancement of knowledge is one of free inquiry, free exchange of the results of research with other scholars in the field, and free criticism. Another characteristic is the opporutnity offered for educating young men and women in the processes and methods of research. The advanced academic degree is a recognition of educational attainment and research accomplishment under conditions of free inquiry, exchange, and criticism. Its use by agencies or institutions which are not and cannot become universities in this sense of the term is a misuse which is both undesirable and unnecessary. A more comprehensive statement of this position is available on request.

(J) Proposal for Research Centers Independent of Universities.

While our Associations recognize that the problems of research in an extremely limited number of areas may require the establishment of research centers away from the site of a university, we believe that such action by Federal or state governments should be taken only when its necessity is unequivocally established. We believe graduate education of high quality is inseparable from basic research, that basic research flourishes best in the atmosphere of an academic institution, and that any national policy of encouraging the establishment of new basic research institutes that are not university-related would be seriously detrimental to both basic research and graduate education.

(K) Land-Grant Teaching Funds, Morrill-Nelson Act.

In the 11 years since the last revision and expansion of the authorization for annual grants for further endowment of instruction in the Land-Grant institutions, there has been continued inflation and substantial population growth. The net result is that the purchasing power represented by these funds has decreased while demands have increased. The

Associations support the expansion of the authorization under this legislation to take account of inflation and population growth over the past decade.

V. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION: UNIQUE CHARACTER OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Associations strongly support activities designed to improve cooperation between the Federal government and state and local governments and to increase the capacity of state and local governments to provide the quality and variety of public services needed in our complex society.

They emphatically call attention, however, to the unique character of higher education as an instrumentality of society. All the states have, by constitutional or legislative action, placed responsibility for governance of public universities and colleges under the control and direction of governing boards separated from direct channels of state administrative and political control. Private institutions have historically enjoyed this status.

In recent years, national legislative proposals have been made which would have the effect of authorizing the administrative branch of the Federal government to require that staffs of both public and private universities and colleges engaged in Federally assisted programs be placed under state merit systems, channeling Federal funds for higher education through state administrative agencies having no jurisdiction under state constitutions or law, by-passing state legislative authority, and assigning planning responsibility for higher education within the states to agencies created for entirely different purposes.

Since inadvertance or lack of awareness of the issues and relationships involved apparently have been responsible for violation in proposed legislation of this sound principle, the Associations respectfully call it to the attention of Congressional committees and Federal agencies dealing with educational legislation and of the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations.

VI. IMPROVING THE CONDITIONS OF URBAN LIFE.

The traditional role of member institutions of these Associations — the role of concern

for and action related to the conditions of the citizenry — is now intensified and expanded by the tremendous urban problems facing our nation. Member institutions of these Associations are heavily involved in research, educational, and public service programs designed to improve the conditions of urban life. As indicated elsewhere, a chief limitation on their ability to respond to urgent requests for expert assistance is lack of resources for this purpose. The Federal government, through the Demonstration Cities and other programs, is engaged in a major effort to assist in rebuilding slums and blighted areas, and provide public facilities and services essential to solving the problems of the people in our cities. The Associations recommend that adequate provision be made, through amendment of present legislation and in future legislation, for continuing grants for the support of research, demonstration, and educational programs in colleges and universities in professional and subject-matter areas related to the objectives of the legislation. This might be accomplished, for example, by setting aside a percentage of appropriations for this purpose, as is done in Federally aided highway and other legislation.

VII. AID TO INDIVIDUALS IN OBTAINING A COLLEGE EDUCATION.

The most effective and most urgently needed form of aid to individuals in obtaining a college education is a program of support for educational institutions to enable them to keep charges to students low. Much of the present demand and need for individual assistance in financing college costs stems from failure to recognize and act on this fact. The Associations, however, recognizing the necessity of dealing with situations as they exist while working toward more fundamental solutions, have supported expanding access to student loans at reasonable carrying charges, expansion of the work-study program, and provision of economic opportunity grants specifically designed to help the most needy gain access to higher education.

The characteristic of programs designed to help individuals meet the rising costs of college, however, is that they result in pyramiding budgetary costs and administrative complexities without getting at the root of the problem. If student charges are permitted to

continue to rise more rapidly than the level of income — which they have done steadily in recent years — more and more students will need special aid and more and more programs must be devised to assist them unless educational opportunity is to be denied. For this reason, our Associations believe that first priority in new programs needs to be given to those which will help keep down the costs of higher education to the students. These are discussed elsewhere. The following comments concern student-aid programs:

(A) N.D.E.A. Student Loan Program.

The National Defense Education Act Student Loan program was established to insure access to low-interest loans to enable students particularly in need of financial assistance to attend college. It is essential that the integrity and identity of this program be maintained. Within this context, the Associations support experimental approaches to the problem of providing the full amount of funds needed while reducing the burden on the Federal administrative budget and on the capital resources of colleges and universities involved in the 1/9 matching requirement.

(B) Guaranteed Student Loan Program.

The Guaranteed Student Loan program was adopted in recognition of the fact that the rising level of student charges in our colleges and universities has caused undue financial burdens on many families in the middle-income level. This program and its purposes should not be confused with those of the N.D.E.A. loan program. Under present credit conditions, the Guaranteed Loan program has been less successful than anticipated because of the lack of availability both of loan guarantee funds and of loans.

We continue to support the central purpose of this program, but observation of the program by our member institutions strongly indicates need for changes in the law. Therefore, we recommend that the law be amended to provide (1) that any Federally guaranteed loan and any loan requiring Federal funds to subsidize interest cost be made only after lenders have secured pertinent information about the borrower from the educational institution involved; (2) that the interest subsidy be terminated one year after the student

borrower has completed his formal education; and (3) that an appropriate fee be established and paid to lenders to cover administrative costs of such loans until money-market conditions are such that an administrative fee is unwarranted.

(C) Work Study.

These Associations, which for many years urged adoption of an experimental work-study program, have previously expressed their continued support of this legislation as an important element in a flexible program of helping worthy students meet college costs. We note, however, that, in this as in many other programs designed to help more students attend college, the institutional matching requirement tends to be counter-productive. That is, in order to get matching funds, institutions must charge students more, increasing the need for additional student aid. We commend the Congress for its emergency action in holding the Federal level of contributions at 85 per cent and recommend that it be restored to at least 90 per cent.

(D) Opportunity Grants, Federal Scholarships, Veterans Education.

The Associations continue to support the educational opportunity grants program as one specifically designed to make college attendance possible for needy students who could not otherwise attend. In connection with other Federal programs (such as Upward Bound), it has become a major means of providing genuine access to higher education for the economically and educationally disadvantaged. The Associations continue to oppose a general Federal scholarship program in the absence of evidence that it would in fact assure college attendance for a substantial number of the highly talented who cannot now attend under existing public and private programs and in view of higher-priority needs for other forms of Federal aid to education.

We express appreciation to the 90th Congress for amending the Veterans Educational Program law to provide for payment of a portion of the cost for special record-keeping, reporting, and counseling services required for veteran, as contrasted to non-veteran, students.

(E) Tax-Credit and Student Loan Indenture Proposals.

Proposals for a direct deduction from income taxes owed the Federal government because of tuition and required fees paid colleges and universities have attracted substantial support because of several assumptions, all incorrect. More recently, widespread publicity has been given a proposal to solve the fiscal problems of higher education by a sharp increase in charges to students coupled with the privilege of borrowing from the Federal government the increasingly substantial sums required, with repayment by the borrower in the form of a special added income tax over 30 to 40 years. Both these proposals are unsound from the standpoint of public policy, educational policy, and fiscal policy. They are discussed separately below.

(1) Tax Credit for Tuition and Fees.

Three assumptions, the first two contradictory and the third untrue, are made in advancing such proposals:

The first is that they will provide relief to hard-pressed parents. A second is that they provide a way around the problems related to direct Federal aid to non-public institutions and would therefore provide for a substantial flow of Federal tax dollars to these and other institutions. A third is that they are so devised as sharply to limit or eliminate aid to the most affluent and give the greatest aid to those in lower income brackets (though admittedly none at all to those who pay no income tax). The first two assumptions are obviously contradictory. If institutions raise fees to collect tax dollars, parents will get no relief. If parents get substantial relief, institutions will not be aided. The third assumption is untrue. Despite limitations on benefits in terms of gross taxable income, the chief bill advanced to date before Congress allows families with taxable incomes in excess of $50,000 to receive some benefits, those with capital-gains incomes well in excess of that amount to receive some benefits, and those with incomes chiefly from tax-exempt sources to benefit without limitation as to total, as compared to taxable, income.

Although percentage benefits are higher for lower-income families, dollar benefits are clearly higher as incomes rise up to

$25,000, while benefits to those with lower incomes steadily decrease to the vanishing point. The Associations have consistently recognized the desirability of participation in various types of Federally-aided programs by both nonpublic and public institutions. They view the tax-credit proposal as inequitable from every standpoint and unsound from the standpoints of fiscal policy, educational policy, and national policy in general. The Treasury Department has ably stated the objections from the standpoint of national fiscal policy. Proponents of this legislation have made it clear that its essential purpose is to give tax support to educational institutions proportional, to some extent at least, to the fees charged students. Since the fees would have to be raised to provide the additional income desired, the benefit would flow to the college, not the taxpayer. To the extent that fees are raised, students from low-income families would find their educational costs increased rather than decreased. Institutions with low tuition charges would be placed under pressure to increase them in order to collect Federal aid by this route. Institutions which wish to engage in discriminatory practices and still enjoy Federal support would be encouraged to do so.

These Associations take the position that, to the extent that Congress finds it in the national interest to provide either general specific-purpose support from public funds for institutions of higher education, ways can and should be found for doing this which retain the principles of public accountability for the expenditure of public funds, which are fiscally and educationally sound, and which do not in their operation discriminate against large groups of students and institutions. The tax-credit approach does not meet these standards.

(2) Student Loan Indenture Proposal (Educational Opportunity Bank).

The proposal described by its proponents as an "Educational Opportunity Bank" can in fact be more accurately described as one through which the student is asked to enter into a special Federal income-tax indenture for most of his working life in order to permit colleges and universities to recapture approximately the full cost of educational services provided through sharp increases in required charges. Its most glaring defect from the standpoint of public policy is that it

proposes to shift to the student virtually all the cost, at an escalating rate, of higher education. Whatever the allocation between the individual and society of the benefits of higher education, it is clear that the primary benefit is to society and that the student is already paying a disproportionally large share, regardless of the type of institution attended or the level of its charges. The argument that the privilege of borrowing large sums with deferred repayment will somehow increase educational opportunity for the economically and educationally disadvantaged will not bear analysis for several reasons; rather, it would, under the name of equality of opportunity, enable a low-income student to start life with a heavy added Federal claim on his income, while freeing the more affluent from any responsibility.

The policy of escalating student charges in all types of institutions would raise economic barriers against low-income and educationally disadvantaged students in institutions which will now admit them and which they can attend at relatively low cost. It would not, however, permit them to attend high-prestige and highly selective institutions, which are neither prepared to relax their admissions standards nor to expand their enrollments in any substantial degree. The highly qualified student from a low-income family can, in general, already attend college through a variety of scholarship programs for the talented. The problem of the educationally disadvantaged student involves a variety of factors. High admissions standards, reluctance to borrow, need of his family for income, and lack of motivation are all elements in his disproportionately low participation in post-high-school education. These problems will not be solved by extending the privilege of borrowing to theoretically enable the student to shop around for a college which will grant admission, in competition with other students with fewer academic and other handicaps.

The Educational Opportunity Bank proposal poses many other major questions, to which answers have not been forthcoming. Its fiscal solvency is clearly dependent on attracting an equal balance between those whose future incomes will be high and those entering low-income professions to permit continued lendings to those whose repayments will be less than their loans. Yet, to be fiscally attractive

to those entering high-income occupations or with family resources which assure high incomes, terms must be such that a large fiscal outlay by the Federal government seems a pre-requisite. If the charges of all colleges are escalated sharply, present ability of the vast majority of students to finance their own education through family aid and earnings will disappear, and heavy borrowing will become for increasing numbers the only avenue of access to higher education. The Educational Opportunity Bank particularly belies its title with respect to young women seeking higher education. To keep the proposal on a sound fiscal basis, proponents point out, women would have to pay back a much higher percentage of income than men, because their incomes are lower. Marriage would involve a substantial reverse dowry. No solutions are suggested in the proposal for either of these problems.

Higher education in the United States has been the means of providing genuine equality of opportunity for increasing numbers of young men and women, because the American people have recognized that education is primarily a social responsibility. They have supported our colleges and universities both directly through public channels and indirectly through voluntary support encouraged by special tax treatment, thus keeping down the financial barriers to education. The philosophy that financing education is primarily the responsibility of the student is directly contrary to this great and sound tradition.

VIII. DISCRIMINATION IN THE USE OF PUBLIC FUNDS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES.

Member institutions of the Associations believe that public policies against discrimination in the use of public funds for educational purposes should apply equally in their use by all types of educational institutions, public and private. They note with regret that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not uniformly apply this standard because of the failure to include a provision against discrimination because of religion in Title VI of this Act, which applies to non-public as well as public colleges and universities. They also note that Title IV of the Act, which requires a survey of the extent of discrimination in education to be made by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, applies only to public institutions at all

levels and not to discrimination in the use of public funds by other institutions receiving them.

It is, therefore, our position that the Civil Rights Act should be amended to ban the use of public funds by institutions which discriminate in the admission of students or employment of staff because of religion, and that, pending such amendment or new educational legislation, the use of tax funds should be barred to institutions which discriminate because of religion. If there is reasonable ground for exception to this rule, such as might be involved in programs of a public welfare rather than of an essentially educational character — such as the school lunch program — such exceptions should be made by explicit exemption from the general rule.

IX. "DISCLAIMER" AFFIDAVITS.

Member institutions of the Associations have consistently opposed the requirement of negative "disclaimer" affidavits, or certificates of non-subversion as a requirement for individuals taking part in non-sensitive Federal programs. Such requirements should not be confused, as they often are, with affirmative statements of loyalty to the United States and its institutions, which may be properly required of those entering posts of public trust. The Associations welcome the relaxation or elimination of such negative requirements. Experience has shown that, while they involve extensive paperwork and record keeping and are a constant source of friction and controversy, they have no affirmative value.

X. EXTENDING THE RESOURCES OF HIGHER EDUCATION BEYOND THE CAMPUS.

The Congress has recognized the great need for Federal aid to make available beyond the confines of the campus the resources of our colleges and universities toward the solution of problems of national and international concern. This is exemplified in such legislation as Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the State Technical Services Act, the Regional Medical Programs Act, legislation affecting the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, and the Smith-Lever Act establishing the

Cooperative Extension Service, which has furnished the example inspiring many of the more recent programs. Through the implementation of programs of continuing education and extension, authorized by these and later acts, the Congress enables universities to bring their unique resources to bear on the needs of communities and individuals for assistance in solving the multiple problems associated with rapid urbanization, technological change, social change, and the needs of the professions, agriculture, labor, business, industry, and the Federal government.

We call attention to the need for:

(A) Full funding of Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to fulfill the Congressional intent to provide comprehensive, coordinated, state-wide programs of continuing education and community service. We support steps to make available a portion of the funds for interstate and regional projects.

(B) Extension of the State Technical Services Act indefinitely, if possible, and certainly for a minimum of five years; for substantial increases in authorizations over present funding levels; and for recognition in the regulations for administering the Act to permit assistance to business and industry in the science of management, as well as in technology.

(C) Early funding of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 in order that the long-recognized educational potential of telecommunications be fully realized.

(D) Maximum effective funding of other established programs, and for continuity of funding in order that the national needs for continuing education, clearly identified by Congress, may begin to be met.

(E) Increased support for problem-oriented research as related to the development of the full potential of extension and public-service programs.

The experience and special competence of the institutions represented in these Associations in the administration of problem-oriented, off-campus programs should be recognized in the allocation of responsibility for administering Federally-aided programs in these areas.

XI. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AND VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

State colleges and universities make important contributions to vocational-technical education in two ways:

(1) Through Occupational Education. Many of these institutions prepare individuals for a variety of technical occupations requiring less than a baccalaureate degree. State and land-grant institutions, for example, conduct some of the nation's most successful associate-degree programs in such fields as engineering, agriculture, the allied health professions, and industrial technology. Those with strong technical-education departments provide training in a manner difficult to duplicate in other types of institutions.

(2) Through the Training of Teachers. Collegiate programs for the preparation of teachers of vocational, technical, and industrial subjects in junior colleges, vocational schools, and technical institutions should be greatly expanded. One of the most pressing needs today is effective teaching of the technical content and skills required for entrance into and advancement in occupations in which manpower is in critically short supply. Technological advancements make it imperative that greatly expanded in-service training opportunities be provided for those currently teaching vocational, industrial, and technical subjects. Shortage of adequately prepared teachers is hampering development and expansion of vocational-technical education.

These Associations therefore, support:

(A) Necessary amendments to and increase in authorizations for the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to permit colleges and universities, including junior colleges and 4-year colleges, to participate more adequately in vocational and technical education programs.

(B) In-service training programs, fellowships for prospective and experienced vocational-education instructors and administrators, and adequate financing of teacher education programs in vocational and technical education.

XII. HUMANE TREATMENT OF EXPERIMENTAL ANIMALS.

During the past decade, much progress has been made by all scientific personnel in providing adequate care of experimental animals. Federal legislation has now been passed to regulate the sale and transportation of research animals and to insure humane treatment for such animals during transportation, sale, and non-experimental periods at research laboratories. We continue to believe this legislation was unnecessary but hope it will prove to be helpful in correcting the isolated difficulties that may exist at research installations and pledge the support of our Associations toward this end. We believe it would be unwise and unnecessary to consider additional legislation regarding the care and handling of laboratory animals.

XIII. NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT.

(A) Water Resource Research.

The Associations have been gratified by the authorization and appropriation to implement Title II of the Water Resource Research Act that make it possible to enlist the competencies of academic and non-academic scientists in seeking solutions of pressing national water problems and to provide for the establishment of the Water Science Information service. We urge, however, that appropriations for the funding of both Title I and Title II programs be increased to the full authorized level.

(B) Sea Grant Colleges

These Associations welcome the Sea Grant Colleges and Program Act to provide for the systematic exploration of the marine environment. We urge continuing appropriations for the program consistent with the importance of vastly expanded knowledge of this up-to-now largely neglected area. Further, we urge continuing emphasis in the administration of the program on the importance of broad, flexible institutional awards, in keeping with the basic Federal government-university relationship underlying the outstanding success of the land-grant programs for agricultural research and extension.

(C) Air and Water Pollution.

We commend the national recognition of the importance of our natural environment through programs that have been established in the Department of the Interior, the Public Health Service, and the Environmental Sciences Service Administration aimed at the understanding and abatement of air and water pollution. We urge that greater emphasis be given in these programs to arrangements that make it possible to enlist the unique competencies of the universities and their faculty members in this national effort.

XIV. INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

The Associations regret that the constructive legislative steps taken by the 89th Congress to expand and improve both educational and technical assistance programs in the international field have not been subsequently implemented. These include Section 211 (d) of the Foreign Assistance Act and the International Education Act. Also, no action has been taken on proposals to provide for Federal assistance, through publicly identified channels, in the participation of American voluntary organizations in international activities.

The Associations are concerned not only with failure to implement the new initiatives authorized, but also with the substantial reductions in support of ongoing international educational and technical assistance programs made by the first session, 90th Congress, at a time when their substantial expansion is clearly called for. Because of this concern, establishment of a Task Force to study and make recommendations particularly with reference to international technical and developmental assistance programs — in cooperation with other educational organizations — has been authorized.

The following actions are clearly needed:

(A) Funding for international technical assistance, educational and cultural exchange, and related activities should be substantially increased beyond the levels provided for fiscal 1969.

(B) Funds to support the planning activities required by law under the International Education Act should be provided at the earliest

possible opportunity; and, for its substantive implementation as authorized, funds must be provided for the 1969 fiscal year.

(C) Since the total authorization of $10 million under Section 211(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act is small in proportion to the need and reductions in technical-assistance appropriations have made even this modest funding impossible, the authorization should be expanded substantially and fully funded.

(D) Authority to conduct technical assistance programs should be extended to at least a five-year period to reduce the uncertainty which has from the beginning hampered the effectiveness in this area.

(E) Provision of funds should be made to colleges and universities to help meet the special costs of giving foreign students an appropriate educational experience in this country, commensurate with the emphasis placed on such efforts as a matter of public policy.

(F) Without specifically endorsing the provisions of any particular legislation pending at this time, these Associations encourage members of the Congress to continue their search for more effective and adequate means for this country to assist in the solution of the world's food problem.

Member Institutions of

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

and

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

ALABAMA
- *Alabama A & M College* •
- Alabama College
- Alabama State College
- *Auburn University*
- Florence State College
- Jacksonville State University
- Livingston State College
- Troy State University
- *University of Alabama*
- University of South Alabama

ALASKA
- *University of Alaska*

ARIZONA
- *Arizona State University*
- Northern Arizona University
- *University of Arizona*

ARKANSAS
- *Agricultural, Mechanical, and Normal College*
- Arkansas A & M College
- Arkansas Polytechnic College
- Arkansas State University
- Henderson State College
- Southern State College
- State College of Arkansas
- *University of Arkansas*

CALIFORNIA
- Chico State College
- Fresno State College
- California State College at Fullerton
- California State College at Hayward
- Humboldt State College
- California State College Kern County
- California State College at Long Beach
- California State College at Los Angeles
- California State Polytechnic College, Pomona
- California State Polytechnic College-San Luis Obispo
- Sacramento State College
- California State College at San Bernadino
- San Diego State College
- San Francisco State College
- San Jose State College
- Sonoma State College

CALIFORNIA *(cont'd.)*
- Stanislaus State College
- *University of California*

COLORADO
- Adams State College
- Colorado State College
- *Colorado State University*
- Metropolitan State College
- Southern Colorado State College
- *University of Colorado*
- Western State College of Colorado

CONNECTICUT
- Central Connecticut State College
- Eastern Connecticut State College
- Southern Connecticut State College
- *University of Connecticut*
- Western Connecticut State College

DELAWARE
- *Delaware State College*
- *University of Delaware*

D. C.
- District of Columbia Teachers College
- Federal City College

FLORIDA
- *Florida A & M University* •
- Florida Atlantic University
- *Florida State University*
- Florida Technological University
- *University of Florida*
- University of West Florida

GEORGIA
- Albany State College
- Armstrong State College
- Augusta College
- Columbus College
- *Fort Valley State College*
- Georgia College at Milledgeville
- *Georgia Institute of Technology*
- Georgia Southern College
- Savannah State College
- *University of Georgia*
- Valdosta State College

GUAM
College of Guam

HAWAII
University of Hawaii

IDAHO
University of Idaho

ILLINOIS
Chicago State College
Eastern Illinois University
Illinois State University
Northeastern Illinois State College
Northern Illinois University
Southern Illinois University
University of Illinois

INDIANA
Ball State University
Indiana State University
Indiana University
Purdue University

IOWA
Iowa State University
University of Iowa
University of Northern Iowa

KANSAS
Fort Hays Kansas State College
Kansas State College of Pittsburg
Kansas State Teachers College
Kansas State University
University of Kansas
Wichita State University

KENTUCKY
Eastern Kentucky University
Kentucky State College
Morehead State University
Murray State University
University of Kentucky
Western Kentucky University

LOUISIANA
Gambling College
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute
Louisiana State University
McNeese State College
Francis T. Nicholls State College
Northeast Louisiana State College
Northwestern State College
Southern University

MAINE
Aroostook State College
Farmington State College
Fort Kent State College

MAINE *(cont'd.)*
Gorham State College
Maine Maritime Academy
University of Maine
Washington State College

MARYLAND
Bowie State College
Coppin State College
Frostburg State College
Maryland State College
Morgan State College
St. Mary's College of Maryland
Salisbury State College
Towson State College
University of Maryland

MASSACHUSETTS
Massachusetts College of Art
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Massachusetts Maritime Academy
State College at Boston
State College at Bridgewater
State College at Fitchburg
State College at Framingham
State College at Lowell
State College at North Adams
State College at Salem
State College at Westfield
State College at Worchester
University of Massachusetts

MICHIGAN
Central Michigan University
Eastern Michigan University
Ferris State College
Grand Valley State College
Lake Superior State College
Michigan State University
Northern Michigan University
University of Michigan
Wayne State University

MINNESOTA
Bemidji State College
Mankato State College
Moorhead State College
St. Cloud State College
Southwest State College
University of Minnesota
Winona State College

MISSISSIPPI
Alcorn A & M College *
Delta State College
Jackson State College
Mississippi State College for Women
Mississippi State University
Mississippi Valley State College
University of Mississippi
University of Southern Mississippi

MISSOURI
Central Missouri State College
Harris Teachers College
Lincoln University
Missouri Southern College
Missouri Western College
Northeast Missouri State Teachers College
Northwest Missouri State College
Southeast Missouri State College
Southwest Missouri State College
University of Missouri

MONTANA
Eastern Montana College
Montana State University
Northern Montana College
University of Montana
Western Montana College

NEBRASKA
Chadron State College
Kearney State College
Peru State College
University of Nebraska
Wayne State College

NEVADA
University of Nevada

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Keene State College
Plymouth State College
University of New Hampshire

NEW JERSEY
Glassboro State College
Jersey City State College
Montclair State College
Newark State College
Paterson State College
Rutgers, The State University
Trenton State College

NEW MEXICO
Eastern New Mexico University
New Mexico State University
University of New Mexico
Western New Mexico University

NEW YORK
Cornell University
State University College at Brockport
State University College at Buffalo
State University College at Cortland
State University College at Fredonia
State University College at Geneseo
State University College at New Paltz

NEW YORK *(cont'd.)*
State University College at Oneonta
State University College at Oswego
State University College at Plattsburgh
State University College at Potsdam
State University of New York
State University of New York at Albany
State University of New York at Buffalo

NORTH CAROLINA
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University
Appalachian State University
Asheville-Biltmore College
East Carolina University
Elizabeth City State College
Fayetteville State College
North Carolina College at Durham
North Carolina State University
Pembroke State College
University of North Carolina
Winston-Salem State College

NORTH DAKOTA
Dickinson State College
Ellendale State College
Mayville State College
Minot State College
North Dakota State University
University of North Dakota
Valley City State College

OHIO
Bowling Green State University
Central State University
Kent State University
Miami University
Ohio State University
Ohio University
University of Akron
Wright State University
Youngstown State University

OKLAHOMA
Langston University
Northeastern State College
Oklahoma State University
Southeastern State College
University of Oklahoma

OREGON
Eastern Oregon College
Oregon State University
Southern Oregon College
University of Oregon

PENNSYLVANIA
Bloomsburg State College
California State College

PENNSYLVANIA *(cont'd.)*
Cheyney State College
Clairon State College
East Stroudsburg State College
Edinboro State College
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Kutztown State College
Lock Haven State College
Mansfield State College
Millersville State College
Pennsylvania State University
Shippensburg State College
Slippery Rock State College
West Chester State College

PUERTO RICO
University of Puerto Rico

RHODE ISLAND
Rhode Island College
University of Rhode Island

SOUTH CAROLINA
Clemson University
South Carolina State College
University of South Carolina

SOUTH DAKOTA
Black Hills State College
General Beadle State College
Northern State College
Southern State College
South Dakota State University
University of South Dakota

TENNESSEE
Austin Peay State College
East Tennessee State University
Memphis State University
Middle Tennessee State University
Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial University
Tennessee Technological University
University of Tennessee

TEXAS
East Texas State University
Midwestern University
North Texas State University
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College
Sam Houston State College
Southwest Texas State College
Stephen F. Austin State College
Sul Ross State College
Texas A & I University
Texas A & M University
Texas Southern University
Texas Technological College
Texas Woman's University
University of Houston

TEXAS *(cont'd.)*
University of Texas
West Texas State University

UTAH
College of Southern Utah
Utah State University
University of Utah
Weber State College

VERMONT
Castleton State College
Johnson State College
Lyndon State College
University of Vermont

VIRGINIA
Longwood College
Madison College
Radford College
Richmond Professional Institute
University of Virginia
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Virginia State College

WASHINGTON
Central Washington State College
Eastern Washington State College
University of Washington
Washington State University
Western Washington State College

WEST VIRGINIA
Concord College
Shepherd College
West Virginia University

WISCONSIN
Stout State University
University of Wisconsin
Wisconsin State University - Eau Claire
Wisconsin State University - La Crosse
Wisconsin State University - Oshkosh
Wisconsin State University - Platteville
Wisconsin State University - River Falls
Wisconsin State University - Stevens Point
Wisconsin State University - Superior
Wisconsin State University Whitewater

WYOMING
University of Wyoming

** Member of both Associations.*

A Note On "Federal Aid"

The term "Federal aid" is commonly used, and is used in this document, as a general term covering all the multiplicity of purposes for which Federal funds flow to institutions of higher education or those attending them. The reader should keep in mind, however, that the term "Federal aid" is inaccurate and misleading as applied to many of these programs. Where the Federal Government, in fulfillment of a clearly defined and asserted national responsibility, uses the services, facilities and personnel of colleges and universities to accomplish this purpose, the term "Federal aid" is not applicable. Indeed when the payment for this use is inadequate to cover its cost, as it frequently is, colleges and universities are supplying fiscal aid to the national government rather than the reverse. Colleges and universities have a responsibility for the national welfare which exceeds that of most other institutions in our society, and on which they are uniquely able to discharge. Willingness to give whole-hearted cooperation in programs of national importance should not, however, obscure the fact that the flow of "aid," both in terms of accomplishment and in fiscal terms, is a two-way flow. Cooperation in the national interest is a better word for it.